UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

DEREK ANTOL, individually, and as next friend for DSA II, DEVON ANTOL and TRYSTON ANTOL,

Case No. 1:17-cv-00613

Hon. JANET T. NEFF

Plaintiffs,

ADAM DENT, KATE STRAUS, CASEY BRINGEDAHL, CASEY TRUCKS, PETE KUTCHES, and WESTERN MICHIGAN ENFORCEMENT TEAM, a public body organized under the laws of the State of Michigan,

Defendants.

J. Nicholas Bostic Bostic & Associates Attorney for Plaintiffs 909 N. Washington Ave. Lansing, MI 48906 (517) 706-0132 barristerbostic@att.net

Allan C. VanderLaan (P33893)
Bradley Charles Yanalunas (P80528)
Curt A. Benson (P38891)
Cummings McClorey Davis & Acho PLC
Attorneys for Defendants Dent, Strauss,
Bringedahl, & Kutches
327 Centennial Plaza Bldg.
2851 Charlevoix Dr., SE
Grand Rapids, MI 49546
(616) 975-7470
avanderlaan@cmda-law.com
byanalunas@cmda-law.com
cbenson@cmda-law.com

Adam P. Sadowski (P73864)
John G. Fedynsky (P65232)
Assistant Attorneys General
Attorneys for Defendant Trucks
Civil Litigation Employment & Elections
P.O. Box 30736
Lansing, MI 48909
(517) 373-6434
sadowskia@michigan.gov
fedynskyj@michigan.gov

Douglas M. Hughes (P30958)
John M. Karafa (P36007)
Williams Hughes, PLLC
Attorneys for Defendants Kutches &
Western MI Enforcement Team
120 W. Apple Ave.
P.O. Box 599
Muskegon, MI 49440
(231) 726-4857
doughughes@williamshugheslaw.com
johnkarafa@williamshugheslaw.com

EXHIBIT A

ANTOL, ET AL. v. DENT, ET AL. DEREK ANTOL

May 10, 2018

Prepared for you by



The Power of CommitmentTM

Bingham Farms/Southfield • Grand Rapids

Ann Arbor • Detroit • Flint • Jackson • Lansing • Mt. Clemens • Saginaw • Troy

DEREK ANTOL May 10, 2018

	Page 2				Page	4
1	APPEARANCES:	1				
2	ENGL STATE OF STATE O	2				
3	J. NICHOLAS BOSTIC	3	WITNESS	PAGE		
4	Bostic & Associates	4	DEREK ANTOL			
5	909 North Washington Avenue	5				
6	Lansing, Michigan 48906	6	EXAMINATION	_		
7	(517) 706-0132	7	BY MR. BENSON:	5		
8	barristerbostic@att.net	8	EXAMINATION	m=		
9	Appearing on behalf of Plaintiffs.	9	BY MR. SADOWSKI:	77		
10	, , ,	10	EXAMINATION	70		
11	CURT A. BENSON		BY MR. BOSTIC:	79		
12	BRADLEY C. YANALUNAS	12				
13	Cummings McClorey Davis & Acho	13 14	EXHIBITS			
14	2851 Charlevoix Drive, SE	15	EARIBITS			
15	Suite 327	16	EXHIBIT	PAGE		
16	Grand Rapids, Michigan 49546	17	(Exhibits attached to transcript.)	, /(GD		
17	(616) 975-7470	18	(Exhibits deficited to standoripa)			
18	cbenson@cmda-law.com byanalunas@cmda-law.com	19	DEPOSITION EXHIBIT 1	73		
19 20	Appearing on behalf of Defendants Dent, Strauss,	20	DEPOSITION EXHIBIT 2	76		
21	Bringedahl, and co-counsel for Defendant Kutches.	21				
22	Dinigedam, and co-counsel for Defendant retteres.	22				
23		23				
24		24				
25		25		00X1V2	**************************************	ery sappara
annem o	Page 3				Page	5
1	ADAM P. SADOWSKI	1	Grand Rapids, Michigan			
1 2	PATRICK MYERS	2	Thursday, May 10, 2018			
3	Michigan Department of Attorney General	3	10:43 a.m.			
4	525 West Ottawa Street	4				
5	Lansing, Michigan 48909	5	DEREK ANTOL,			
6	(517) 373-6434	6	was thereupon called as a wit			
7	Sadowski A@michigan.gov	7	7 having first been duly sworn to testify to the truth,			
8	MyersP@michigan.gov	8	the whole truth and nothing b			
9	Appearing on behalf of Defendant Casey Trucks.	9	examined and testified as foll			
10		10	EXAMINATION	l		
11		11	BY MR. BENSON:	Danger and Form		
12			12 Q. Mr. Antol, my name is Curt Benson, and I represent			
13		ŧ	some of the officers that you filed this lawsuit			
14		14	against. Have you ever been de	enosed before?		
15				cpoace siciore:		
16		17	16 A. No. 17 Q. Okay. Well, I'm sure you talked to your lawyer about			
17		18				
18 19		19				
20		20				
21		21 Q. If you, for some reason, don't understand a question				
22		1	22 I'm asking, would you please ask me to either repeat			
23		23 it or restate it so you understand exactly what it is				
24		24		-		
25		25				



The Power of Commitment™

DEREK ANTOL May 10, 2018

	Page 74	Page 76
1	BY MR. BENSON:	1 Q. Did he give any additional information other than to
2	Q. All right, I'll hand you what's been marked as 1, that	2 show her the card or, excuse me, show her the
3	is the Affidavit of Adam Dent. You've had the	3 paperwork, to your knowledge?
4	opportunity to review that, correct?	4 A. Not to my knowledge.
5	A. Correct.	5 Q. Okay. Your attorney was kind enough to provide us
6	Q. Just now, correct?	6 with a report of inspection from the State of Michigan
7	A. Correct.	7 Department of Treasury detailing the inspection that
8	MR, BENSON: Okay. Could you read the	8 occurred on July 9th of 2014. Much of what they
9	question back to the witness?	9 described occurred when you were not present. The
10	(The requested portion of the record was	10 last paragraph just above the phrase seizure of
11	read by the reporter at 12:14 p.m.)	tobacco products has a paragraph in there that I
12	A. Okay, the statements made on the first page of the	wonder if you would take a moment to read that
13	Affidavit, I don't object to anything on there. What	paragraph? I'm sorry, it's the one just above it's
14	I had issues with was the references to the other	that one right there, yeah, the last paragraph just
15	things, for instance, the McQueen and the Hartwick	before seizure of tobacco products?
16	case, you know, his affirmations that our business	16 A. Okay, and your question is?
17	model was running the same as these other two	17 Q. Does that accurately describe your encounter with the
18	individuals, when they in fact did not apply at all to	author of this report?
19	our model. I mean, I guess that would be the only	19 A. Yes. In compact form, yes.
20	thing that I'd disagree with.	MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION
21	BY MR. BENSON:	21 DEPOSITION EXHIBIT 2 22 12:19 p.m.
22	Q. Okay. And just for point of clarification, you're on	
23	page 2?	Q. Normally, you do this first, but I'll hand you what's been marked as Exhibit Number 2, and that is the
24	A. Correct.	25 report of inspection. And I had just asked you a
25	Q. Okay. Could you just kind of point generally where	大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大大
		- DD
	Page 75	Page 77
1	we're talking about?	1 question about that last paragraph.
2	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this.	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to?
1	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over.	 question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes.
2 3 4	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay.	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing
2 3 4 5	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you.
2 3 4 5 6	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION
2 3 4 5 6 7	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court of Appeals case People V Hartwick. And I assume you	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. SADOWSKI:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court of Appeals case People V Hartwick. And I assume you don't disagree with his interpretation of the case,	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. SADOWSKI: Q. Mr. Antol, I'm Adam Sadowski, as you know, I represent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court of Appeals case People V Hartwick. And I assume you don't disagree with his interpretation of the case, you just disagree with that your business model was	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. SADOWSKI: Q. Mr. Antol, I'm Adam Sadowski, as you know, I represent Defendant Trucks.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court of Appeals case People V Hartwick. And I assume you don't disagree with his interpretation of the case, you just disagree with that your business model was similar to People V Hartwick?	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. SADOWSKI: Q. Mr. Antol, I'm Adam Sadowski, as you know, I represent Defendant Trucks. I've seen your discovery responses, and you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court of Appeals case People V Hartwick. And I assume you don't disagree with his interpretation of the case, you just disagree with that your business model was similar to People V Hartwick? A. Correct.	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. SADOWSKI: Q. Mr. Antol, I'm Adam Sadowski, as you know, I represent Defendant Trucks. I've seen your discovery responses, and you would agree that you personally, on behalf of just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court of Appeals case People V Hartwick. And I assume you don't disagree with his interpretation of the case, you just disagree with that your business model was similar to People V Hartwick? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Is that also true with the excuse me,	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. SADOWSKI: Q. Mr. Antol, I'm Adam Sadowski, as you know, I represent Defendant Trucks. I've seen your discovery responses, and you would agree that you personally, on behalf of just yourself, are not making any claims against Defendant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court of Appeals case People V Hartwick. And I assume you don't disagree with his interpretation of the case, you just disagree with that your business model was similar to People V Hartwick? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Is that also true with the excuse me, another case he cites, which is State V McQueen? Do	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. SADOWSKI: Q. Mr. Antol, I'm Adam Sadowski, as you know, I represent Defendant Trucks. I've seen your discovery responses, and you would agree that you personally, on behalf of just yourself, are not making any claims against Defendant Trucks, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court of Appeals case People V Hartwick. And I assume you don't disagree with his interpretation of the case, you just disagree with that your business model was similar to People V Hartwick? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Is that also true with the excuse me, another case he cites, which is State V McQueen? Do you disagree that State V McQueen is applicable to	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. SADOWSKI: Q. Mr. Antol, I'm Adam Sadowski, as you know, I represent Defendant Trucks. I've seen your discovery responses, and you would agree that you personally, on behalf of just yourself, are not making any claims against Defendant Trucks, correct? A. Correct. I don't believe I had any encounter with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court of Appeals case People V Hartwick. And I assume you don't disagree with his interpretation of the case, you just disagree with that your business model was similar to People V Hartwick? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Is that also true with the excuse me, another case he cites, which is State V McQueen? Do you disagree that State V McQueen is applicable to your case?	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. SADOWSKI: Q. Mr. Antol, I'm Adam Sadowski, as you know, I represent Defendant Trucks. I've seen your discovery responses, and you would agree that you personally, on behalf of just yourself, are not making any claims against Defendant Trucks, correct? A. Correct. I don't believe I had any encounter with Trucks.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court of Appeals case People V Hartwick. And I assume you don't disagree with his interpretation of the case, you just disagree with that your business model was similar to People V Hartwick? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Is that also true with the excuse me, another case he cites, which is State V McQueen? Do you disagree that State V McQueen is applicable to your case? A. Correct.	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. SADOWSKI: Q. Mr. Antol, I'm Adam Sadowski, as you know, I represent Defendant Trucks. I've seen your discovery responses, and you would agree that you personally, on behalf of just yourself, are not making any claims against Defendant Trucks, correct? A. Correct. I don't believe I had any encounter with Trucks. C. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court of Appeals case People V Hartwick. And I assume you don't disagree with his interpretation of the case, you just disagree with that your business model was similar to People V Hartwick? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Is that also true with the excuse me, another case he cites, which is State V McQueen? Do you disagree that State V McQueen is applicable to your case? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And I think you said that was it?	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. SADOWSKI: Q. Mr. Antol, I'm Adam Sadowski, as you know, I represent Defendant Trucks. I've seen your discovery responses, and you would agree that you personally, on behalf of just yourself, are not making any claims against Defendant Trucks, correct? A. Correct. I don't believe I had any encounter with Trucks. Q. Okay. A. To my knowledge. He may have been at the store, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court of Appeals case People V Hartwick. And I assume you don't disagree with his interpretation of the case, you just disagree with that your business model was similar to People V Hartwick? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Is that also true with the excuse me, another case he cites, which is State V McQueen? Do you disagree that State V McQueen is applicable to your case? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And I think you said that was it? A. Yes.	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. SADOWSKI: Q. Mr. Antol, I'm Adam Sadowski, as you know, I represent Defendant Trucks. I've seen your discovery responses, and you would agree that you personally, on behalf of just yourself, are not making any claims against Defendant Trucks, correct? A. Correct. I don't believe I had any encounter with Trucks. C. Okay. A. To my knowledge. He may have been at the store, but there was probably close to, I don't know, eight or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court of Appeals case People V Hartwick. And I assume you don't disagree with his interpretation of the case, you just disagree with that your business model was similar to People V Hartwick? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Is that also true with the excuse me, another case he cites, which is State V McQueen? Do you disagree that State V McQueen is applicable to your case? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And I think you said that was it? A. Yes. Q. Okay. All right.	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. SADOWSKI: Q. Mr. Antol, I'm Adam Sadowski, as you know, I represent Defendant Trucks. I've seen your discovery responses, and you would agree that you personally, on behalf of just yourself, are not making any claims against Defendant Trucks, correct? A. Correct. I don't believe I had any encounter with Trucks. C. Okay. A. To my knowledge. He may have been at the store, but there was probably close to, I don't know, eight or reight to 12 officers at the store. I couldn't tell
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court of Appeals case People V Hartwick. And I assume you don't disagree with his interpretation of the case, you just disagree with that your business model was similar to People V Hartwick? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Is that also true with the excuse me, another case he cites, which is State V McQueen? Do you disagree that State V McQueen is applicable to your case? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And I think you said that was it? A. Yes. Q. Okay. All right. A. Thank you.	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. SADOWSKI: Q. Mr. Antol, I'm Adam Sadowski, as you know, I represent Defendant Trucks. I've seen your discovery responses, and you would agree that you personally, on behalf of just yourself, are not making any claims against Defendant Trucks, correct? A. Correct. I don't believe I had any encounter with Trucks. Q. Okay. A. To my knowledge. He may have been at the store, but there was probably close to, I don't know, eight or reight to 12 officers at the store. I couldn't tell
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court of Appeals case People V Hartwick. And I assume you don't disagree with his interpretation of the case, you just disagree with that your business model was similar to People V Hartwick? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Is that also true with the excuse me, another case he cites, which is State V McQueen? Do you disagree that State V McQueen is applicable to your case? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And I think you said that was it? A. Yes. Q. Okay. All right. A. Thank you. Q. Sure. Do you know what Detective Dent said to Ms. Conklin in buying the marijuana? He just showed	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. SADOWSKI: Q. Mr. Antol, I'm Adam Sadowski, as you know, I represent Defendant Trucks. I've seen your discovery responses, and you would agree that you personally, on behalf of just yourself, are not making any claims against Defendant Trucks, correct? A. Correct. I don't believe I had any encounter with Trucks. C. Okay. A. To my knowledge. He may have been at the store, but there was probably close to, I don't know, eight or eight to 12 officers at the store. I couldn't tell who was an officer, who wasn't. Some were in uniform, some were you know, they had like open carrying, I guess. There was quite a few people out in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court of Appeals case People V Hartwick. And I assume you don't disagree with his interpretation of the case, you just disagree with that your business model was similar to People V Hartwick? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Is that also true with the excuse me, another case he cites, which is State V McQueen? Do you disagree that State V McQueen is applicable to your case? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And I think you said that was it? A. Yes. Q. Okay. All right. A. Thank you. Q. Sure. Do you know what Detective Dent said to Ms. Conklin in buying the marijuana? He just showed	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. SADOWSKI: Q. Mr. Antol, I'm Adam Sadowski, as you know, I represent Defendant Trucks. I've seen your discovery responses, and you would agree that you personally, on behalf of just yourself, are not making any claims against Defendant Trucks, correct? A. Correct. I don't believe I had any encounter with Trucks. Q. Okay. A. To my knowledge. He may have been at the store, but there was probably close to, I don't know, eight or eight to 12 officers at the store. I couldn't tell who was an officer, who wasn't. Some were in uniform, some were you know, they had like open carrying, I guess. There was quite a few people out in the parking lot, some customers, some neighbors. But I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	we're talking about? A. Yep, pretty much all of this. Q. Okay, thank you. Let me quick look this over. Oh, I see, okay. I got you, okay. You make reference to, it looks like paragraph 8, which is a reference to a Michigan Court of Appeals case People V Hartwick. And I assume you don't disagree with his interpretation of the case, you just disagree with that your business model was similar to People V Hartwick? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Is that also true with the excuse me, another case he cites, which is State V McQueen? Do you disagree that State V McQueen is applicable to your case? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And I think you said that was it? A. Yes. Q. Okay. All right. A. Thank you. Q. Sure. Do you know what Detective Dent said to	question about that last paragraph. Is Exhibit 2 what you were referring to? A. Yes. MR. BENSON: Okay, I've got nothing further, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. SADOWSKI: Q. Mr. Antol, I'm Adam Sadowski, as you know, I represent Defendant Trucks. I've seen your discovery responses, and you would agree that you personally, on behalf of just yourself, are not making any claims against Defendant Trucks, correct? A. Correct. I don't believe I had any encounter with Trucks. Q. Okay. A. To my knowledge. He may have been at the store, but there was probably close to, I don't know, eight or eight to 12 officers at the store. I couldn't tell who was an officer, who wasn't. Some were in uniform, some were you know, they had like open carrying, I guess. There was quite a few people out in the



The Power of Commitment**

DEREK ANTOL May 10, 2018

Page 78	Pana RN
against Trucks, or is it just Devon and Derek, is it? A. Yeah, I think it would be just Devon and Derek. Q. Okay. A. Or maybe Tryston did, too, because Trucks was at the home. Q. Okay. What did Devon tell you that Defendant Trucks did, or was he able to provide you with that level of detail? A. To me, he hasn't, no. I mean, they it's hard to say, because, I mean, we're I can't even put a face to the name. I mean, I and I wasn't there at the house. To me, it would be different if you were asking the kids and you had a picture of him, and then they'd be able to specify, you know, okay, yeah, I remember this guy, you know, whatever. But as far as me, I wasn't at the home, and Devon and Tryston weren't at the moment either. So as far as I know,	1 off the internet. Do you know I wanted to clarify 2 whether this is something that you or I printed off? 3 A. I didn't. 4 Q. Or whether it was part of Parolini's report, if you 5 remember? 6 A. I didn't print this off. 7 Q. Okay. 8 A. This isn't anything I did. 9 Q. All right. When we had a break, did we you and I 10 have an opportunity to discuss who Michael Tozer might 11 be? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. What do you think? 14 A. I believe he was my electrician. 15 MR. BENSON: Oh, thank you. I know the 16 reference then, thanks. 17 A. Okay.
with Trucks, it would have only been Derek, to my 19 knowledge. But, I mean, there may be other things 20 ensuing per the you know, the our alleged 21 illegal search and seizure, you know, things that were 22 his room and his due process being violated, that's 23 I don't I don't believe I'm part of that. 24 Q. Okay. Other than Defendant Trucks being involved in 25 the search of the North Green Creek residence, is	18 BY MR. BOSTIC: 19 Q. And the looking at your Interrogatory Answers, 20 under number 9, I want to see if you want to correct 21 your answer about whether E was from the same incident 22 in July as as D? Do you understand that D was the 23 July 9, 2014 search warrant on all three locations, 24 correct? 25 A. Okay. Page 81
there any other claims, to your knowledge, on behalf of any of your kids against Defendant Trucks? A. Here again, to reiterate, we're not sure which one of the officers he is. A picture to my son would help clarify that. He may or may not have been one of the two officers holding a gun at my son. I can't say. I wasn't there. That would be a question for my son. MR. SADOWSKI: Okay. Well, then I have no further questions, thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. BOSTIC: Q. I just want to clear up a couple things while we're all here together. Look at Exhibit 2. MR. BENSON: That's the inspection right there. MR. BOSTIC: A. Me or him? BY MR. BOSTIC: Q. You. The last few pages. A. Yeah, this was the sample of the Q. Right? A. — shisha. But what I wanted to clarify for the record was that we have a report, which is seven pages, the first seven pages. The last few pages appear to be printed	1 Q. And then later in that same year, did you have a separate case? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. Okay. So E was not — they were resolved together, correct? 6 A. Correct. 7 Q. But they didn't occur together? 8 A. But it was dropped, but they didn't occur together. 9 MR. BOSTIC: Okay, that's all I have. 10 MR. BENSON: I don't have anything further. 11 MR. SADOWSKI: I don't either. 12 (The deposition was concluded at 12:25 p.m. 13 Signature of the witness was not requested by counsel for the respective parties hereto.) 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

